



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE POSITION OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS

BY MRS. GILBERT E. JONES,

Chairman National League for the Civic Education of Women,
New York City.

The Anti-Suffragists are not organizing or rushing into committees, societies or associations, and their doings are not being cried out from the house-tops. Yet they show by undeniable facts, easily verified, that woman suffrage bills and proposals have been defeated and turned down at the rate of once in every twenty-seven days in the State legislatures for the last twelve years. The "Antis" have been especially successful in Kansas, where, in 1887, women obtained municipal suffrage. For twenty-two years the suffragists have tried to extend it to State and Federal suffrage, but without success, and the "Antis" seem to know why.

A great many States have granted to women school suffrage, but only a partisan or sectarian issue will bring out the woman's vote. In Massachusetts women have voted on school boards, and after thirty years' training, only two or three per cent. of the women register to vote. This hardly can be pronounced "success," or worth while. "Antis" do believe, however, that women can well serve on educational boards. With universal manhood suffrage there cannot exist such a condition as would warrant the suffragists to cry "taxation without representation is tyranny." Men do not vote because they pay taxes, why should women?

In the early history of our States, men and women voted because they paid taxes, property or money voted. But qualified suffrage has given way to "universal suffrage," because property qualifications were unrepblican, undemocratic, favoring the aristocratic wealthy citizens, and showing a decided discrimination against the educated and poorer citizens. The Anti-Suffragists generally believe the suffragists are asking for universal suffrage and *not* qualified suffrage, which tax-paying suffrage means. Taxation means protection and not representation. All books and authorities on "taxation" will tell any one caring for further information of this fact. Vattel, "Laws of Nations," says: "The

right to tax an individual results from the general protection afforded to himself and his property."

Judge Story says: "Where there is no protection there can be no claim to allegiance or obedience." "Taxes are a portion which each individual gives of his property, in order to secure and have the perfect employment of the remainder. Governments are established for the protection of persons and property within the limits of the State, and taxes are levied to enable the government to afford and give such protection. They are the price and consideration of the protection afforded." (J. Ingersoll, Circuit Court of the United States.) "There is nothing poetic about tax laws—When they find property, they claim a contribution for its protection." (Lowery, Chief Justice.)

Taxation without representation is tyranny, but we must be very careful to define what we mean by the phrase. If we adopt the suffrage attitude, "I pay taxes, therefore I should vote," the natural conclusion is that *everybody* who pays taxes should vote, or we have a tyrannical form of government. Remember that this argument is used in an unqualified way. We have a "tyranny" here we are told, because some women pay taxes, yet do not vote. If this is true without any qualification, it must be true not only of women, but of everybody. Accordingly this government is tyrannical if corporations pay taxes, but do not vote; if aliens pay taxes, but do not vote; if minors pay taxes, but do not vote; if anybody pays taxes, but does not vote. The only correct conclusion is, not that women should vote because some of them pay taxes, but that every taxpayer should be given the privilege of the ballot. Under our system of indirect taxation it is almost impossible to say that everybody is not a taxpayer—therefore it would seem that *every* man, woman and child, naturalized or alien, and every corporation, should vote. The absurdity of this is evident. Even if woman suffrage were granted, fifty per cent. of the population would still be without the ballot, and every one of these could stand up and say, as the suffragists are saying now, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." "I am taxed but unrepresented, therefore I am being tyrannized over."

It is clear that the phrase is distorted. The distortion lies in the fact that the suffragists are trying to make an individual right out of a principle of government. If women vote because they pay

direct taxes, many will be enfranchised who never earned a dollar, and who own their property wholly through the accident of inheritance. Thousands of women will be discriminated against, in favor of a few. Hundreds of women teachers would never have the advantages that a favored aristocracy of wealth would have. There would be a complete inequality of political privileges for women. Statesmen, lawyers, citizens, and the wise men from the North, South, East and West have been consulted, and have conscientiously discussed this question of who should vote, with the result that tax-paying qualifications have been done away with, and universal manhood suffrage has been generally adopted.

A very conscientious investigation by this League can not find that the ballot will help the wage earning woman. Women must resort to organization, association and trade unions, and then they can command and maintain a standard wage. Supply and demand will do the rest. Women are not well trained and often very deficient and unskilled in most of their occupations. They are generally only supplementary workers and drop their work when they marry. When married, and home and children are to be cared for, they are handicapped way beyond their strength. Married women should be kept out of industry, rather than urged into it, as scientists, physicians and sociologists all state that as women enter into competitive industrial life with men, just so does the death rate of little children increase and the birth rate decrease.

Anti-Suffragists deplore the fact that women are found in unsuitable occupations. But the suffragists glory in the fact that there are women blacksmiths, baggage masters, brakemen, undertakers, and women political "bosses" in Colorado.

The suffragists call this progress, independence and emancipation of women. Antis asks for more discrimination and better selection of industrial occupations for wage earning women. Knowing that the average woman has half of the physical strength of the average man, and the price she must pay when in competition with him is too great for her ultimate health, and her hope of motherhood, the "Antis" ask for caution and extreme consideration before new activities are entered upon.

Miss Sumner in her book, "Equal Suffrage," published by the Collegiate Equal Suffrage League, states that woman suffrage in Colorado has not fulfilled its expectations, and that the improved

salaries to be paid to women have not been realized. The average wages, even of women teachers, are still decidedly lower than those of men. She also tells us that many of the best laws in the interest of women and children have been passed, sometime *before* women were granted the franchise. Had women never voted, those laws would probably have been passed anyway; and in States where women do not vote, one finds better conditions for women, children and wage-earners than in the four suffrage States. This all goes to prove that the ballot in the hands of women is not essential for reforms, good laws, or the betterment of women and children.

The suffrage leaders say that a woman without the vote has no self-respect. We must then look to the suffrage States to find the fulfillment of the woman's true position, complete—worthy, exalted and respected. But what do we find when we look at Utah! Women have voted there for forty years. Mormonism and woman suffrage were coincident. By the very nature of its teachings, as indicated by Brigham Young, the basis of the Mormon Church is woman,—and the Mormon Church is the greatest political machine in the four suffrage States.

Women suffragists have lived openly and defiantly in a state of complete polygamy in Utah, and yet they have had the vote and political power. The only form of the Turkish harem found in the United States is in this woman suffrage State. Here we find the answer so often asked,—“If women vote, would a priest have power or influence over the women of this parish?” Utah answers the question—the Elders command—the woman's religious fervor makes her obey, and her hero worship of the Elder weakens her judgment. Polygamy was maintained in Utah for these reasons, and it was only when the Federal Government stepped in, that these un-American and unwholesome conditions were forbidden by law. Even now, that the Mormon woman can again vote, polygamy is not wholly done away with. Authorities say it never will be, until woman suffrage ceases, as sixty per cent. of the voters are women, and they keep the Mormon Church in power, as the Elders dictate.

With this state of affairs, do we find women more self-respecting where they vote, than where they do not? Is Utah a more self-respecting State for women, than Massachusetts? Martha Cannon was elected state senator. She was on the ticket against her husband, who was nominated for the same office on the Re-

publican ticket. I copy from the *Salt Lake Herald* a few sentences taken from an interview with Mrs. Cannon, state-senator-elect. When asked if she was a strong believer in woman suffrage, she answered, "Of course I am. It will help women to purify politics." "Women are better than men. Slaves are better than their masters." She was then asked, "Do you refer to polygamy?" "Indeed I do not" she answered. "I believe in polygamy,—a plural wife isn't half as much of a slave as a single wife. If her husband has four wives, she has three weeks of freedom every single month. Of course it is all over now, but I think the women of Utah think with me, that we were much better off with polygamy. Sixty per cent. of the voters of Utah are women. We control the State. What am I going to do with my children while I am making laws for the State? The same thing I have done with them, when I have been practicing medicine. They have been left to themselves a good deal. Some day there will be a law compelling people to have no more than a certain amount of children, and then the mothers of this land can live as they ought to live." This is the character and opinion presented by the *highest* State official that woman suffrage has as yet given to the United States of America. Do we want any more of them? Will not American women express their disapproval and disgust at such sentiments as these? We anti-suffragists glory over the fact that Utah is not an "anti" State. What would Miss Shaw say of us, "antis" and "polygamists!" Yet it has stood for forty years, and still stands, to as great a measure as they dare, woman suffrage and polygamy! Woman suffrage and polygamy, men and women with full political power, and religious freedom, were working together, and yet Mrs. Cannon and the woman suffragists speak of purifying politics! Here is their best example after a test of forty years and more. Why do the suffragists have so little to say about Utah? And why are there more Mormons in the four suffrage States than in all of our other States put together? Is it true that women will uplift the condition of women? Look to Utah and find the answer, because there they have full political power like men.

The question of woman suffrage should be summed up in this way: Has granting the ballot to women in the two suffrage States where they have had it for forty years brought about any great reforms or great results? No—Wyoming has many more men than

women, so the results cannot be measured. The Mormon women of Utah are not free American citizens. They are under the Elder's supreme power and vote accordingly, and polygamy has been maintained by the woman's vote, and is still to be found, although forbidden, because women have political power.

Have the saloons been abolished in any of the suffrage States? No.

Do men still drink and gamble? Yes, without doubt.

Have the slums been done away with? Indeed no.

Are the streets better cleaned in the States where women vote? No, they are quite as bad as in New York City and elsewhere.

Have the red-light districts been cleared away? Decidedly not, and they can be reckoned upon as a political factor, when they are really needed.

Have women purified politics? No, not in the least.

Have women voted voluntarily? Some do; but thousands are carried to the polls in autos and carriages, otherwise they would not vote.

Has pure food and pure milk been established by the woman's vote? Not at all.

Have women's wages been increased because women vote? No, indeed.

Have women equal pay for equal work? Not any more than in New York City.

Are there laws on the statute books that would give women equal pay for equal work? No, and never will be.

Are women treated with more respect in the four suffrage States than elsewhere. Not at all,—certainly not in Utah,—and when political men and women are working together, all kinds of men speak to women, and women cannot do anything but tolerate the political intruder,—as men and women are equal where women vote.

Women suffragists believe suffrage is a success in the above-mentioned four States—and they have ample *suffrage* testimony to satisfy them.

The "antis" in their investigation find positive proof that many men and women can not tolerate the suffrage for women and pronounce it a failure.

The real truth is that woman suffrage is absolutely *futile*,

neither good nor bad, but unnecessary. What women accomplish in all other States *without* the votes, that denotes progress, reforms and betterment of conditions for women, children and humanity, is solely attributed to the ballot in the States where women vote. The franchise granted to women, means a doubling of all the evils now existing in manhood suffrage and this cannot mean progress.

"In the tabernacle of life, man dwells in the outer courts, woman ministers at the holy of holies—her influence upon humanity is so primal, so intimate, so dominant, that it might seem almost divine. Herein lies her superiority. In coarse and common service, in the race of the swift and the battle of the strong, man immeasurably outstrips her. In the higher service of love, which lies above battle-field and race course, of whose ministry God himself is the only exemplar, she holds a position so advanced that man is not even her competitor."